



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/675,304	07/01/96	ASGHAR	S 19516/189
		EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20007-5109		B3M1/0527	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 14
		2317	
		DATE MAILED: 05/27/97	

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 3/17/97 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 23, 25-32, and 34 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 1-22, 24, and 33 have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 23, 25-32, and 34 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2317

1. The request for reconsideration filed March 1, 1997 has been entered and considered by the examiner.

2. Claims 23, 25-32, and 34 are presenting for examination.

3. Claim 32 recites the limitation "said first memory and said second memory " in line 2 .

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 23, 25-26, 28-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article of "Multiple Read Single Write Memory and Its Applications", by Chang.

Art Unit: 2317

7. As to claims 23,25-26, and 28-29, Chang shows in Fig 3, an apparatus comprising:

- * a first processor P1;
- * a second processor P2;
- * a first memory M1;
- * a second memory M2.

The first processor P1 having write access at any time to any location in the first memory M1 and read access at any time in the first memory M1 and the second memory M2. Also, the second processor P2 having write access at any time to any location in the second memory M2 and read access at any time in the first memory M1 and the second memory M2. Wherein the two processors operate independently of each other, see page 1, col 1, lines 13-14, col 2, lines 42-44, page 2, col 1, lines 24-25, col 2, lines 1, lines 10-16, lines 25-27, page 3, col 1, lines 13-15, lines 32-37, page 4, lines 33-36, col 2, lines 2-5, lines 7-9, page 5, col 2, lines 19-24.

8. As to claim 31, the claim is similar in scope to claim 23, and it is rejected under the same rationale, see paragraph 7 above.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 7-8 that Chang anticipates claims 23,25-26,28-29& 31.

9. Claims 27, 30, 32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Jamoua (US Pat. No. 4967398).

Art Unit: 2317

10. As to claim 27, Chang shows in Fig 3, an apparatus as been discussed in paragraph 7. Chang does not explicitly shows that his apparatus could be used to control servo loop function of a system . The use of multiple processors to control servo loop function of a system was well known in the art as been disclosed by Jamoua, see col 1, lines 28-34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Chang to control a servo loop function of a system in order to provide the desired system operation, see Jamoua, col 1, lines 22-25.

11. As to claim 34, the claim is similar in scope to claim 27, and it is rejected under the same rationale, see paragraph 10 above.

12. As to claim 30, Chang shows in Fig 3, an apparatus as been discussed in paragraph 7. Chang does not explicitly shows that his apparatus could use shared memory having the first memory and the second memory. The use of shared memory among a plurality of processors to perform their functions was well known in the art as been disclosed by Jamoua, see col 1, lines 25-34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Chang to use a shared memory among the processors in order to increase the access speed between the processors and the shared memory.

Art Unit: 2317

13. As to claim 32, the claim is similar in scope to claim 30, and it is rejected under the same rationale, see paragraph 12 above.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 10-13 that the combination of Chang and Jamoua teaches the limitations of claims 27, 30, 32, and 34.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. .

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23, 25-32, and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M. Meky whose telephone number is (703) 305-9697.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

M.M.M

May 22, 1997



MOUSTAFA M. MEKY
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300